UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.105/C.2/SR.576
7 April 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Thirty-third session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 576th MEETING

Held at the Vienna International Centre, Vienna,
on Monday, 28 March 1994, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. MIKULKA (Czech Republic)

CONTENTS

General exchange of views (continued)

Consideration of the legal aspects related to the application of the principle that the exploration and utilization of outer space should be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all States, taking into particular account the needs of developing countries (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of distribution of this document to the Head, Translation Service, room D0749.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

V.94 22270 7060E Distr.: 11 April 1994

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

1. Mr. SOLENDIL (Observer for Turkey) said that, although Turkey did not have a long history of space activities, both the legal and the scientific and technical aspects of space-related issues were closely followed by the Turkish authorities and the necessary organizational adjustments were being made to meet the requirements arising in that field.

2. The Eurasian Space Symposium, which had been held in Turkey in 1993 and attended by some 250 scientists and engineers from 16 different countries, had concluded in a discussion at which a decision had been taken to establish a standing committee to make the symposium a traditional event. The committee, whose membership comprised representatives from Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan, had decided to hold the second symposium at Kiev in 1994 and the third at Baku in 1995.

3. The construction of the Turkish National Observatory had been proceeding on schedule in 1993 and its facilities would be available for international use and collaboration.

4. As a party to the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Outer Space Treaty) and other related international instruments, his country supported the principle that the exploration and use of outer space should be for peaceful purposes and be carried on for the benefit of all countries irrespective of their levels of development. It also believed that international cooperation to the broadest extent possible was essential for the implementation of those principles.

5. Mr. CREGO (Observer for Cuba) said that Cuba was endeavouring to develop the applications derived from space research despite the country's current economic difficulties, and that the presence of his delegation at the current session of the Subcommittee was an expression of Cuba's political will to continue to be associated with the peaceful uses of outer space and to make its contribution, albeit modest, to the related activities.

6. At the Second Space Conference of the Americas held at Santiago in 1993, several projects had been proposed with a view to assisting the States of the Latin American region in exploiting the knowledge derived from the utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes and in contributing to the protection of the Earth's environment. Despite the little progess so far achieved, due mainly to a lack of resources, it was encouraging to note the efforts of the Office for Outer Space Affairs to develop cooperation through the organization of training courses, workshops and conferences, and the donation of equipment and material. In that connection, Cuba intended to promote the holding of international summer courses and lectures on the study and monitoring of the Earth's environment and natural resources for the benefit of the countries of the region.

7. With regard to the question of the early review and possible revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space, Cuba felt that, although the Principles were generally acceptable, they were

capable of revision, provided that such revision was directed towards raising levels of safety with a view to preventing possible disasters or mitigating their consequences.

8. Regarding the definition and delimitation of outer space and the consideration of ways and means to ensure the rational and equitable use of the geostationary orbit, his delegation wished to stress the need for such definition and delimitation to be in accordance with the provisions of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. While recognizing the role of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), his delegation believed that the geostationary orbit should be regarded as a limited natural resource over which no State or group of States could exercise sovereignty to the detriment of other States.

9. Finally, his delegation fully supported the consideration of the legal aspects related to the application of the principle that the exploration and utilization of outer space should be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all States, taking into particular account the needs of developing countries.

10. Ms. GRÄFIN von ROEDERN (Germany) said that her delegation felt that the time was not yet ripe to review the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space, since any such review should be based on a thorough scientific analysis by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. The time allotted to the corresponding agenda item could thus be reduced. As to the general issue of the duration of the Subcommittee's sessions, there was a need for flexibility in the allocation of time for delegations' deliberations. Since at present there was no need for a substantive discussion of nuclear power sources, the Subcommittee's current session could be shortened, but without prejudice to the length of future sessions.

11. Regarding the definition and delimitation of outer space and the utilization of the geostationary orbit, her delegation had made its position clear at previous sessions of the Subcommittee. That position remained unchanged, and her delegation would accordingly not intervene during the deliberations on that agenda item. It would, however, present a detailed statement on the question of outer space benefits.

12. Mr. CEDE (Austria) said that the items on the Subcommittee's agenda merited serious consideration, not only in terms of their content but also in view of their possible implications. It was on that basis that the possibility of the need for a questionnaire concerning aerospace objects had been raised in the Subcommittee's discussions. Such a questionnaire could serve to provide information on the practical experiences of States engaged in space activities, with a view to ascertaining the practices adopted by them, and could also be used to obtain States' opinions on the desirability of establishing a specific legal regime and their views as to the form such a regime should take. However, the draft questionnaire before the Subcommittee (see document A/AC.105/C.2/1993/CRP.1 reproduced in document A/AC.105/544, annex II, appendix) contained a mix of ideas and suggestions that called for closer examination and some reformulation. It was necessary to streamline the questions and to focus them more precisely on specific matters, and a clear distinction needed to be made between questions of practice and issues relating to existing or future legal rules.

13. With regard to the definition and delimitation of outer space, the fact that the international scientific community and the Subcommittee had been debating that topic for several years could suggest that a clear dividing line might be unnecessary and that a distinction between the scope of applicability of outer space law and aerospace law could be avoided by a functional approach. Space activities to date did not appear to have suffered from a lack of regulation in that respect.

14. As to the question of nuclear power sources, his delegation felt that there was not an urgent need to engage at the current session in an in-depth discussion of the question of possible revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space. However, if it was felt necessary to debate the issue, a degree of flexibility should be exercised in allocating the time to be spent on it.

15. Regarding the application of the principle that the exploration and utilization of outer space should be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all States (see document A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 reproduced in document A/AC.105/544, annex IV), his delegation believed that the issue related primarily to the question of how equity could be defined in outer space law under the present circumstances. The extensive discussions on that topic in other forums had shown that such general concepts did not lend themselves to a uniform definition but were always governed by the specific circumstances of a given case. That was true of the many uses of outer space, and general clauses relating to benefits and interests had to be formulated in the light of those different space activities. By avoiding abstract notions and concentrating on specific issues, it should be possible for the Subcommittee to establish precisely the benefits and interests that a particular space activity represented for individual States.

16. His delegation believed that space debris constituted a threat to other uses of outer space and was thus a question that called for urgent action in both the scientific and legal fields. However, more precise information on the related facts was necessary before work began on the elaboration of legal rules, and a thorough examination should be initiated to assess the existence and amount of space debris and the threats presented by it. The compilation of factual information should not be undertaken by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee; perhaps an academic seminar should be organized to provide the necessary data for the Subcommittee's future work.

17. Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) said that Chile had assiduously striven to ensure that outer space activities had a positive impact on the social and economic development of nations. The work of formulating space law accordingly needed to be centred on the concept of international cooperation, which, in the current circumstances, was more necessary than ever before. According to General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, outer space was not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty. The concept of international cooperation was also referred to in many provisions of the treaties currently governing space activities.

18. The Subcommittee's work concerning outer space benefits was particularly relevant in that connection. Working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1, originally submitted by ten delegations including his own and co-sponsored at the current session by Iraq and Egypt, provided a useful basis for further,

non-confrontational negotiation on the matter. All States should have the right to decide the modalities of their cooperation, provided that the principles of solidarity and equity were observed in international relations. Outer space activities should be conducted in conformity with the principles of space law, in conjunction with the right to humanitarian assistance and the principle of the international duty to cooperate. It was essential to attempt to rectify existing inequalities through widespread dissemination of information on space science and technology.

19. His delegation wished to express a number of concerns about the nature of the Committee's work. It was unfortunate that the current session had been organized at a time when a four-day holiday weekend intervened. Many delegations had repeatedly warned against any reduction in the meeting time allocated to the Subcommittee. The loss of time was all the more serious in that many delegations had had to travel long distances to attend the session. In future, the importance of continuity should be kept in mind.

20. Any efforts to reduce the length of the Subcommittee's sessions ran counter to the aspirations of a majority of States which, while not engaging in major space activities themselves, were nevertheless affected by such activities. It was for such countries that a legal framework had to be developed in order to ensure that space activities were carried out to benefit all mankind, in conformity with the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

21. An attempt should also be made to incorporate new topics in the Subcommittee's agenda, drawing from the wide range of space activities that could usefully be discussed.

22. Chile strongly supported the attempts of the Colombian delegation to advance the Subcommittee's discussion of the question of the geostationary orbit. Every effort must be made to ensure that the exercise was a fruitful one. Concerning the benefits of space activities, some delegations opposed the development of legal principles in that area, but it should be borne in mind that the Subcommittee was a forum for the evolution of space law. To represent its task as merely to engage in a general exchange of views would be to undermine the basis of its work. It would also be inconsistent with the desire of Member States for increased efficiency in the work of United Nations bodies.

23. Efforts to establish a legal framework for space activities, in conformity with the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, should be pursued as aggressively as possible.

24. Mr BAT-ERDENE (Mongolia) said his delegation agreed that there was a need to define and delimit outer space clearly, with the possibility of future review of that definition and delimitation if required. Such an approach would facilitate the establishment of a regime for vehicles in both airspace and outer space. His delegation welcomed the working paper submitted by the Russian Federation at the thirty-first session in document A/AC.105/C.2/L.189.

25. Outer space in general, and the geostationary orbit in particular, should be the province of all mankind and should be rationally and equitably utilized and explored for the benefit of all States, with particular attention paid to the needs of the developing countries. A special legal regime should be

established for the geostationary orbit, without prejudice to the role of ITU. It was to be hoped that the working paper submitted by Colombia at the previous session (A/AC.105/C.2/L.192) would pave the way for further negotiations.

26. On the benefits of space activities, his delegation's view was that the principles adopted should promote international cooperation and ensure that all States, particularly the developing countries, benefited equally from space activities. Working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 provided a good basis for consideration of the matter.

27. His delegation supported the general view that any future revision of the Principles Relevant to the Use of Nuclear Power Sources in Outer Space should be based on scientific and technical developments in that field. Such a revision should strengthen the safety norms provided by the Principles.

28. The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee should make a thorough scientific and technical analysis of the phenomenon of space debris as a basis for future work by the Legal Subcommittee on an international legal regime for such matters. The Subcommittee should consider the possibility of a mechanism for cooperation with the Conference on Disarmament on the peaceful uses of outer space, with the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on the issue of space debris and with the United Nations Environment Programme on the issue of outer space environment protection.

CONSIDERATION OF THE LEGAL ASPECTS RELATED TO THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE THAT THE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION OF OUTER SPACE SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT FOR THE BENEFIT AND IN THE INTERESTS OF ALL STATES, TAKING INTO PARTICULAR ACCOUNT THE NEEDS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (agenda item 5) (continued) (A/AC.105/544; A/48/20)

29. Ms. VENTURINI (Italy) said that since outer space was a global resource, it must remain accessible to all countries. Such an approach was essential in monitoring the Earth's environment using remote-sensing satellites. Developing countries must be able to take advantage of space technology, mainly for food production and for planning and environmental purposes. International cooperation and the transfer of know-how must facilitate the enhancing of indigenous capabilities in the area of remote sensing.

30. The use of outer space for peaceful purposes and the development of space technology must proceed through improved political, scientific and technical cooperation between industrialized and developing countries. Her country took part in a wide range of activities that had direct benefits for developing countries. Italy was a party to the basic multilateral treaties on cooperation in the exploitation of outer space and participated actively in the activities of ITU and in the INTELSAT and INMARSAT programmes. Her country was strongly committed to European space cooperation within the framework of EUTELSAT and the European Space Agency (ESA). It was involved in various ESA bodies concerned with sharing the benefits of space technology with developing countries. In May 1994, Italy would be involved in the second European-Latin American Space Days, which would bring together policy makers and space experts with a view to increasing an understanding of the potential for regional cooperation to meet specific regional needs. Italy remained willing to improve its bilateral cooperation with the developing countries.

31. The successful conclusion of the GATT Uruguay Round in December 1993 would positively affect the distribution of benefits deriving from space activities. The General Agreement on Trade in Services provided a new set of multilateral rules for services trade, and the new rules on telecommunications, which affected access to and use of public telecommunications services and networks and encouraged technical cooperation to assist developing countries in such areas, would help to promote creative activities and innovation and to safeguard intellectual property. The Agreement on Trade-related Investment Measures would facilitate the elimination of national provisions that restricted and distorted trade. Such new developments must be taken into account in a discussion of legal aspects of the spin-off benefits of space activities.

32. Mr. LOUET (France) said that his country's bilateral cooperation efforts were chiefly the responsibility of the National Centre for Space Studies (CNES), its branches and affiliated organizations. France was a leading member of the European Space Agency (ESA), whose cooperation activities throughout the world were being diversified and expanded. As a space research and development agency, ESA was not responsible for development assistance per se. Nevertheless, a number of its programmes had potential repercussions in the area of development assistance. A working group had recently been set up to examine the question and to propose a scheme that would more clearly define the forms of ESA's involvement in that area.

33. France's bilateral cooperation involved various activities, including training for developing countries, transfer of know-how and technology and support for operational services. Courses, seminars and colloquia were organized in France and abroad by organizations and firms specializing in the application of space technology. Courses had been held in a number of Latin American countries and specialized instruction in space physics had been given in the Niger; a similar programme was to be carried out in Kenya in 1995. At Toulouse, training was provided in remote-sensing techniques and data processing. CNES had helped to set up a permanent facility for instruction in remote-sensing techniques in Thailand. France was also helping to establish teams of space technology specialists in the Maghreb countries: after specialized training in France, Moroccan, Algerian and Tunisian engineers returned to their homelands with the objective of launching space projects of particular concern to their countries.

34. Experts in the application of space technology were often seconded, thereby ensuring the adaptation of existing resources to the specific needs of various countries. A French expert had recently been sent to Tunisia to help find ways to expand remote-sensing techniques for the purpose of promoting sustainable development. Numerous activities and expert missions had been carried out for many years in Africa, South-East Asia and Latin America.

35. With regard to studies and pilot activities, in 1993 CNES and its subsidiary bodies had participated in studies on the application of remote-sensing satellite data in a number of African and Asian countries, mainly for the purposes of agriculture and mapping. The company "Scot Conseil" had been responsible for ensuring the transfer of skills and know-how to the beneficiary countries in many of those projects.

36. Another aspect of cooperation concerned the development of appropriate infrastructures for the reception and proper use of space data. In 1993 CNES had been actively involved in the planning of a receiving station at Nairobi which was intended to process Earth observation data.

37. As to alert and rescue systems, more countries were showing an interest in joining the COSPAS/SARSAT system. Such forms of cooperation allowed developing countries to gain access to technology and know-how in the field of telecommunications.

38. Lastly, France was closely following the progress of activities under the United Nations space programme, in particular preparations for the centres for space, science and technology education recommended by the Office for Outer Space Affairs. Moreover, in 1993 France had helped to fund and send specialists to the United Nations Regional Conference on Space Technology for Sustainable Development in Africa. It was also assisting in preparations for the ESCAP Ministerial Conference to be held in September at Beijing.

39. In view of the scale and range of French cooperation in space activities, he was concerned by the approach advocated in document A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 to the complex issue entrusted to the Subcommittee by the General Assembly in resolution 48/39. He had strong reservations regarding the form of the proposed document. If the "principles" were legally binding, they would unduly restrict cooperation. If they were not intended to be binding, a term other than "principles" would be preferable.

40. He also had reservations concerning the substance of the document. Firstly, freedom of choice of partners was essential. Secondly, he was not in favour of according priority to multilateral cooperation, since he believed that in such a technically advanced area as space activities bilateral cooperation remained the best means of transferring technology and know-how. Thirdly, he could not accept a kind of "most favoured nation clause", requiring conditions offered to one State to be extended to others. In order to be effective, each cooperation agreement must remain specific.

41. France attached importance to economic sovereignty and in particular to industrial property rights and believed that each State should be free to decide what technology it wished to transfer under its cooperation programmes. Such cooperation must also be as balanced as possible, and there should be a quid pro quo for technology transfer.

42. It was important to set realistic objectives, and it would be unwise to envisage large-scale transfers of technology: there were considerable commercial interests at stake and, in any case, major development issues were dealt with in other forums. Moreover, the transfer of specific space applications required beneficiary countries to have appropriate infrastructures. Lastly, in the interests of global security and in accordance with the relevant international non-proliferation agreements, strict guarantees must be provided in connection with the final use of equipment and technology transferred.

43. He wished also to draw attention to the fact that the traditional division between developing and developed countries did not correspond to the distinction between countries in a position to transfer space technology and the potential beneficiaries. South-South cooperation was now needed.

44. Mr. SCHROGL (Germany) said that the most important result of the Subcommittee's discussions seemed to be the realization that cooperation in space activities could not and should not be forced upon States. There ought also to be consensus on the mutual benefit to be derived from international cooperation, since most space activities were international by nature.

45. German cooperation in that area was not limited to industrialized countries: it was being widely extended to developing countries through international, multilateral and bilateral channels, as would be seen from document A/AC.105/567/Add.3.

46. The Subcommittee seemed to have reached a common understanding that under agenda item 5 it should deal with the question of how to conduct cooperation and not how to institutionalize it. His delegation suggested that, to sharpen the focus, consideration should be given to specific forms of contract and codes of conduct.

47. Germany would like further information on the experience of developing countries in cooperation on space activities, in particular with respect to regional cooperation, to help Germany to see how it could best accommodate the particular interests of the developing countries in the field of space applications.

48. Germany also considered that more account should be taken of the activities of international and non-governmental organizations, such as the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) and the Space Agency Forum. An example of such an activity was the UNIDO programme for realizing the benefits of new technology spin-offs in developing countries, with particular reference to space technologies.

49. Mr. BARSEGOV (Russian Federation) said he would like to comment on working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1. He hoped that the discussion on the issue of the further democratization of cooperation would not develop into an opposition between "haves" and "have-nots", countries with space capabilities being represented as wishing to monopolize technology. The current system of space cooperation was more complex. It was worthwhile recalling the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, adopted after ten years of negotiations. At the time it had been seen as a model for future relations in regard to the use of areas and resources declared a "common heritage". Some of the principles enshrined in the Convention were similar in content to those proposed in the working paper. What must not be forgotten was that it had taken more than ten years to reach the number of ratifications required for the Convention to enter into force - and the number had not included those countries that were supposed to provide financial and technological assistance. In view of that experience and the high cost of activities in space, the Subcommittee should seek the most universally acceptable solution without further delay.

50. He was not in favour of a reference to the "special needs of developing countries" - what of the "special needs" of other countries? The Russian Federation considered that any principles must be based on a balance of interests, though that did not mean that the needs of developing countries would not be given due attention. The sovereignty of States in taking decisions concerning their participation in international relations was not

compatible with the requirement in section II, paragraph 3, of the draft principles (A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1, annex) that conditions offered to one State in a specific cooperation programme should be extended to other countries. The inclusion of the term "as appropriate" in the paragraph would not solve that problem since countries wishing to benefit from the conditions would always argue that it was "appropriate". Clearly, the various criteria relating to the organization and conditions of cooperation should be established on a case-by-case basis.

51. As to the transfer of specialized equipment and technical know-how, it was not possible to establish principles for appropriate procedures and criteria without thorough consideration of the intellectual and property rights aspects. The problem of ensuring the transparency of programmes and activities in developing countries carried out with the assistance of the space Powers was a different matter.

52. While the Russian Federation was in favour of providing assistance to countries which did not yet have space capabilities, it considered that to speak of the "redistribution of the spin-off benefits of space science and technology" made little sense from an economic standpoint.

53. The basic ideas outlined in the working paper should be examined in the light of differing national interests. To that end, it would be useful if developing countries with space and related technological capabilities could submit material to the next seesion of the Subcommittee setting out their ideas on new ways of pooling efforts and resources in space activities. He hoped that once such material was available the Subcommittee would be able to examine the issues from a more realistic standpoint and seek a more generally acceptable solution.

54. Mr. HASIBUAN (Indonesia) welcomed working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 as a basis for the Legal Subcommittee's further discussion of item 5 of its agenda. His delegation supported the objective of the utilization of space activities for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all mankind.

55. The internationalization of space activities and the development of space technology also included the area of industrialization, commercialization and privatization, with all the relevant implications, and his delegation thanked the Secretariat for having organized a symposium on the commercialization of space activities, which had shed light on the various commercial aspects of the utilization of space and revealed their complicated nature.

56. In his delegation's view the Subcommittee should redouble its efforts in connection with agenda item 5, in the interests of promoting international cooperation in outer space activities, with the results of space exploration and exploitation being shared for peaceful purposes and for the common benefit of developed and developing countries.

57. His delegation considered that access to space technology and applications, the development of the indigenous capabilities of all States in space science and technology and their application, as well as sovereignty, should be paramount considerations.

58. Mr. SUAREZ (Mexico) said that, in his delegation's view, working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 still provided a good basis for the consideration of a question that was of particular interest to the developing countries.

59. The discussion had demonstrated the importance attached by various delegations to international cooperation on space activities and to the sovereign right of States to determine how such cooperation should be carried out and how to put into practice policies of international cooperation. The view had also been expressed that economic restrictions could affect patterns of cooperation, with consequences primarily for the developing countries. The working paper took that situation into account. The Subcommittee must remember that current economic and social restrictions, including those in the developed countries, might have an adverse effect on the present climate, conducive to international cooperation.

60. His delegation therefore suggested that further efforts should be made to consider the financial implications of the proposals under consideration. All parties should be able to take their decisions with a full knowledge of the facts, so that the risk of disrupting the present favourable climate of international cooperation could be avoided.

61. Mr. REESE (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to reiterate its concern regarding the form and, in certain respects, the substance of working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1.

62. The United States had consistently expressed the view that the Subcommittee did not have a mandate to develop new legal principles under item 5 of its agenda. While welcoming the statements of the sponsors of the working paper that the proposals in the paper were not intended to contradict the provisions of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, in his delegation's view it was not useful to try to develop such principles. The discussion was likely to be more productive if efforts were concentrated on an in-depth analysis of the application of existing principles to the subject.

63. The United States believed that the responsibilities of the Subcommittee included the development of new legal regimes or principles where there had been a decision by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, in accordance with its practices, to pursue such objectives. However, it also considered that the responsibilities of the Subcommittee included activities other than the development of new legal regimes or principles. Not only was it appropriate for the Subcommittee to engage in an exchange of views on the application of existing law: such activities could make valuable contributions to the exploration and utilization of outer space.

64. The discussions engendered by the working paper had encouraged the Subcommittee to analyse important aspects of the item. The United States intended to continue to take part in the discussions of the Working Group on the Benefits of Outer Space, subject to the reservations he had stated.

65. Mr. REY CORDOBA (Colombia) said that his delegation was impressed by the importance attached by delegations to working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 of which his delegation was a co-sponsor. The sponsors would need to study the points raised by the representatives of France and the Russian Federation, before responding.

66. Mr. GONZALEZ (Chile) supported the previous speaker's remarks. He would welcome clarification from the United States representative as to what the Subcommittee could do other than develop new legal regimes or principles. It was clear that the Subcommittee was not a forum for academic debate, but that it had a specific mandate from its parent body.

67. Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria) said that the Subcommittee had heard an impressive description of cooperation by developed countries with the developing world. However, bilateral cooperation was principally geared to mutual advantage. The impression should not be conveyed that the developing countries must simply enjoy the end-product of research and development in the developed countries; they must not be seen as unable to muster indigenous initiatives and incapable of taking their destinies into their own hands in such matters as those relating to the exploration and exploitation of outer space. There was much to gain for all countries in mutuality of interests and complementarity of experiences. Bilateral cooperation was not prejudicial to international cooperation, but it tended to adapt a multilateral model.

68. Mr. TELLES RIBEIRO (Brazil) said that delegations had now had time to consider working paper A/AC.105/C.2/L.182/Rev.1 and had made some constructive criticisms that the sponsors would study.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.